

# Our Times-Dispatch

DAILY—WEEKLY—SUNDAY.

Business Office, 516 E. Main Street.

TELEPHONES.

Business Office, 516 E. Main Street.

Editorial Department, 516 E. Main Street.

Circulation Department, 516 E. Main Street.

Washington Bureau, 501 14th St., N. W.

Manchester Bureau, 1102 Hull St.

Petersburg Bureau, 44 N. Sycamore St.

BY MAIL, One Six Three One.

POSTAGE PAID, Year, Mos. Mos. Mo.

Daily, with Sun., \$5.00 \$3.00 \$1.50 .55

Daily, without Sun. 4.00 2.00 1.00 .55

Sun. edition only 2.00 1.00 .50 .25

Weekly (Wed.) 1.00 .50 .25 .15

By Times-Dispatch Carrier Delivery

Service In—

Richmond (Sub-

urbs), Manchester

&amp; Petersburg.

Daily, with Sunday, 14 cents.

Daily, without Sun., 10 cents.

Sunday Only, 6 cents.

Entered January 27, 1903, at Richmond,

Va., as second-class matter under act

of Congress of March 3, 1879.

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 27, 1905.

To struggle up is a painful process;

most painful because no outside crit-

icism touches us so keenly as the cen-

sures of our higher self on the self that

fell. That, indeed, is the very judg-

ment before which every soul stands

ashamed, and beside which the praise

and blame of the world is nothing and

of no account.

—F. E. MONTRESOR.

Judge Lewis Calls for Federal

Troops.

In 1876, Rutherford B. Hayes was the

Republican nominee for the presidency

against Samuel J. Tilden, Democrat. In

that year the Democrats of the whole

country aroused themselves and elected

their man, but Mr. Tilden was counted

out, and Mr. Hayes was counted in by the

most infamous usurpation of which any

party in the history of this republic was

ever guilty. Throughout the campaign

political feeling was intense. The Re-

publicans became alarmed and knew that

they must resort to desperate measures

in order to carry the election. Having

failed in this, they finally resorted to

usurpation to count their candidate in.

In spite of a clear majority in the Elec-

torial College against them.

But this article is not designed to dis-

cuss in detail the issues of that cam-

paign. Its purpose is to recall and em-

phasize an incident of that campaign

which has a very present bearing on Vir-

ginia politics in the year of our Lord,

1905.

On Saturday afternoon, November 4, 1876,

the people of Richmond were astonished

to hear that a company of United States

soldiers had passed through the city en

route for Petersburg. "Near as we live

to that goodly city," said the Dispatch

of November 6th, "no rumor had reached

us of disturbances there or of any ap-

prehended, and the action of the Pres-

ident, therefore, caused profound wonder."

The arrival of these soldiers in Petersburg

was no less a surprise in the Cockade

City, but they had not been at the sta-

tion five minutes before the news spread

in all directions, and a large crowd of

negroes soon collected. "There is a re-

joicing among the colored people," said

the Dispatch's Petersburg correspondent,

"which is general and open. They are in

the very best of humor and the matter is

discussed by them in crowds all about

the streets. In the same letter the cor-

respondent further said: "The troops come,

of course, in response to the request of

C. P. Ramsdell, the United States mar-

shal for this district, backed by other

Radicals, high and low, who profess to

fear intimidation on election day, and

they are sent here with the forlorn hope

that their presence may help to elect Dr.

Jorgensen." This Dr. Jorgensen, it should

be explained, was an interloper, who was

first appointed postmaster and afterwards

nominated by the Republicans for Con-

gress from the Fourth District. Mr.

Ramsdell, as already stated, was United

States marshal and chairman of the Re-

publican Executive Committee.

Colonel William E. Cameron was then

Mayor of Petersburg, and in letters to

Marshal Ramsdell, he declared that dur-

ing the past six weeks he had visited

every county in the district (and on

every court-green had witnessed large

and mixed assemblages of whites and

blacks, of Democrats and Republicans,

and had yet to hear of one altercation,

of one blow struck, or even of any quar-

rel having its origin in political dif-

ferences. He said that no man or set of

men could, without utter perversion of

the truth, assert that there was any dispo-

sition exhibited by any class of people of

Petersburg to interfere by force with

the lawful rights of any other class, or

that the authorities lacked either the

determination or the power to prevent se-

ditional disturbances and to punish the of-

fenders. There was much more of the

same sort in the letters of Mayor

Cameron, and the same information was

conveyed by him to the President. But

in spite of his assurances and protest,

the troops were sent.

There was great indignation throughout

the entire State, so much so that Gov-

ernor Kemper issued a proclamation pro-

tecting against this trespass upon the

rights of the State by the Federal gov-

ernment.

"No domestic violence," said he, "no

breach of the peace, no molestation of

any citizen in the exercise of his rights

exists, or is threatened, or apprehended,

or likely to arise in this Commonwealth.

Perfect peace, order and security reign

throughout all our borders. Every citi-

zen of whatever race, color or condition

is protected, can be protected and will

be protected, in all his personal and

political rights, privileges and immunities

by all the authorities of the State. No

application by the Legislature or by the

Executive has been made to the Presi-

dent for protection against domestic or other violence. No complaint is made anywhere that the rights of any citizen are assailed or threatened. But in the midst of profound peace and without a constitutional regulation from any quarter, the President of the United States has stationed troops in a little city of our Commonwealth with the design, as cannot be doubted, of intimidating the people and controlling the pending election for partisan purposes.

So much for the testimony of the Mayor of Petersburg, substantiated by the testimony of the Governor of Virginia, that there was no occasion whatever for the presence of United States troops on that occasion.

But there was another official who testified differently. He was then United States district attorney for the Eastern District of Virginia, and he wrote a letter to Dr. Jorgensen, pledging himself to go to Washington and tell the President that in his judgment it would be criminal to fail to send troops to Petersburg. True to his word, he made the following affidavit:

"I am from my knowledge that the last State election, and other elections held in Petersburg prepared to say that unless the marshal is furnished with a better and more reliable posse than he will be able to summon to his aid from residents of the city, the election on the 7th of November in that city will be a farce as gigantic as it will be fraudulent. I am not now prepared to express the opinion that the presence of troops to assist the marshal's posse will be essential to the preservation of order and to insure a fair election at other points in the Eastern District of Virginia, but of the necessity of their presence to prevent bloodshed and SECURE A FAIR ELECTION IN PETERSBURG (I repeat ours). I think there cannot be a shadow of doubt." (See Congressional Record, Forty-fourth Congress, second session, p. 563.)

The United States official holding office under the Republican administration who made that affidavit and who did what he could to bring these troops into Virginia on election day, was L. L. Lewis, the man who is now running for Governor of Virginia on the Republican ticket. He speaks with absolute certainty as to the need of troops in Petersburg, yet in a speech subsequently delivered by Colonel R. E. Withers, of Virginia, in the Senate of the United States, reviewing this outrage, it was stated that Mr. Lewis was not in the Fourth Congressional District during that canvass and could not of his personal knowledge have known that troops were needed in Petersburg.

Now, Democrats of Virginia, how do you like the exhibit? Some of you are saying that Judge Lewis is such a fine gentleman that he will make a fine Governor. We have reminded you from time to time that although Judge Lewis is a fine gentleman, he is a life-long Republican; that he has repeatedly held office under a Republican administration; that he has in all campaigns stood with the Republican party, and now we show by the record that in 1876, it was upon his suggestion and assurances that a Republican President sent United States troops to the city of Petersburg in order "to insure a fair election." Judge Lewis pleads eloquently for the new Republican party, bleached and reformed. But it is the same old party and he was a member of it in the days of reconstruction, force bills and Federal troops-at the polls, returning boards, Hayes Electoral Commission and all the rest, and he must bear his part of the responsibility for the acts of his party.

A Republican with such a political record cannot be elected Governor of Virginia. In 1876 he asked for Federal troops in Virginia on election day in defiance of the protest of the then Governor of Virginia. It is a fair inference that if he should himself be Governor of Virginia, and the campaign of 1876 should be repeated, he would call for Federal troops.

How can any Democrat think of voting for such a man?

What Mr. Roosevelt Denied.

"It seems to be a fair question," remarks the Springfield Republican, "whether it seems to be a fair question whether President Roosevelt does not owe Judge Albert B. Parker a public apology. The President's quick sense of 'squareness' must certainly be much troubled by the disclosure that at the very moment in November when he was hotly resenting Judge Parker's charges regarding the squeezing of corporations for Republican campaign money, the committee charged with forwarding his canvass was accepting money abstracted from a fund for the assistance of widows and orphans and using it to promote his election. Probably Judge Parker at the time never supposed the case was quite as flagrant as it is now known to have been."

It may be inferred from this and similar statements that President Roosevelt denied that the Republican campaign committee had received any contributions from corporations. It is fair to state, however, that the President made no such denial. In fact he admitted that such contributions had been made, but what he did deny with indignation was the charge of Judge Parker that Secretary Cortelyou had used the information which he had gained as a member of the President's Cabinet to compel the corporations to come down with the cash.

It is none of our business to defend Mr. Roosevelt. We are simply giving information in the interest of truth.

The Irreligious Hat.

The rector of a Jersey City church has taken the ladies of his congregation to task for their increasing tendency to come to church without their hats. Upon his return from a European trip, the parson noticed that this habit had grown apace, and he forthwith reproved the women of the church in the columns of the parish weekly. The point is rather an interesting one. The Jersey City rector based his argument mainly upon the fact that "the glory of a woman is her hair," upon which, as one of her chief charms, the sex is wont to lavish much time and attention. He says that an elaborate coiffure hatlessly displayed in church is a means of attracting the attention of men and "is not in harmony with the angelic spirit which we have just described." This point viewed in a purely controversial

dent for protection against domestic or other violence. No complaint is made anywhere that the rights of any citizen are assailed or threatened. But in the midst of profound peace and without a constitutional regulation from any quarter, the President of the United States has stationed troops in a little city of our Commonwealth with the design, as cannot be doubted, of intimidating the people and controlling the pending election for partisan purposes.

So much for the testimony of the Mayor of Petersburg, substantiated by the testimony of the Governor of Virginia, that there was no occasion whatever for the presence of United States troops on that occasion.

But there was another official who testified differently. He was then United States district attorney for the Eastern District of Virginia, and he wrote a letter to Dr. Jorgensen, pledging himself to go to Washington and tell the President that in his judgment it would be criminal to fail to send troops to Petersburg. True to his word, he made the following affidavit:

"I am from my knowledge that the last State election, and other elections held in Petersburg prepared to say that unless the marshal is furnished with a better and more reliable posse than he will be able to summon to his aid from residents of the city, the election on the 7th of November in that city will be a farce as gigantic as it will be fraudulent. I am not now prepared to express the opinion that the presence of troops to assist the marshal's posse will be essential to the preservation of order and to insure a fair election at other points in the Eastern District of Virginia, but of the necessity of their presence to prevent bloodshed and SECURE A FAIR ELECTION IN PETERSBURG (I repeat ours). I think there cannot be a shadow of doubt." (See Congressional Record, Forty-fourth Congress, second session, p. 563.)

The United States official holding office under the Republican administration who made that affidavit and who did what he could to bring these troops into Virginia on election day, was L. L. Lewis, the man who is now running for Governor of Virginia on the Republican ticket. He speaks with absolute certainty as to the need of troops in Petersburg, yet in a speech subsequently delivered by Colonel R. E. Withers, of Virginia, in the Senate of the United States, reviewing this outrage, it was stated that Mr. Lewis was not in the Fourth Congressional District during that canvass and could not of his personal knowledge have known that troops were needed in Petersburg.

Now, Democrats of Virginia, how do you like the exhibit? Some of you are saying that Judge Lewis is such a fine gentleman that he will make a fine Governor. We have reminded you from time to time that although Judge Lewis is a fine gentleman, he is a life-long Republican; that he has repeatedly held office under a Republican administration; that he has in all campaigns stood with the Republican party, and now we show by the record that in 1876, it was upon his suggestion and assurances that a Republican President sent United States troops to the city of Petersburg in order "to insure a fair election." Judge Lewis pleads eloquently for the new Republican party, bleached and reformed. But it is the same old party and he was a member of it in the days of reconstruction, force bills and Federal troops-at the polls, returning boards, Hayes Electoral Commission and all the rest, and he must bear his part of the responsibility for the acts of his party.

A Republican with such a political record cannot be elected Governor of Virginia. In 1876 he asked for Federal troops in Virginia on election day in defiance of the protest of the then Governor of Virginia. It is a fair inference that if he should himself be Governor of Virginia, and the campaign of 1876 should be repeated, he would call for Federal troops.

How can any Democrat think of voting for such a man?

What Mr. Roosevelt Denied.

"It seems to be a fair question," remarks the Springfield Republican, "whether it seems to be a fair question whether President Roosevelt does not owe Judge Albert B. Parker a public apology. The President's quick sense of 'squareness' must certainly be much troubled by the disclosure that at the very moment in November when he was hotly resenting Judge Parker's charges regarding the squeezing of corporations for Republican campaign money, the committee charged with forwarding his canvass was accepting money abstracted from a fund for the assistance of widows and orphans and using it to promote his election. Probably Judge Parker at the time never supposed the case was quite as flagrant as it is now known to have been."

It may be inferred from this and similar statements that President Roosevelt denied that the Republican campaign committee had received any contributions from corporations. It is fair to state, however, that the President made no such denial. In fact he admitted that such contributions had been made, but what he did deny with indignation was the charge of Judge Parker that Secretary Cortelyou had used the information which he had gained as a member of the President's Cabinet to compel the corporations to come down with the cash.

It is none of our business to defend Mr. Roosevelt. We are simply giving information in the interest of truth.

The Irreligious Hat.

The rector of a Jersey City church has taken the ladies of his congregation to task for their increasing tendency to come to church without their hats. Upon his return from a European trip, the parson noticed that this habit had grown apace, and he forthwith reproved the women of the church in the columns of the parish weekly. The point is rather an interesting one. The Jersey City rector based his argument mainly upon the fact that "the glory of a woman is her hair," upon which, as one of her chief charms, the sex is wont to lavish much time and attention. He says that an elaborate coiffure hatlessly displayed in church is a means of attracting the attention of men and "is not in harmony with the angelic spirit which we have just described." This point viewed in a purely controversial

dent for protection against domestic or other violence. No complaint is made anywhere that the rights of any citizen are assailed or threatened. But in the midst of profound peace and without a constitutional regulation from any quarter, the President of the United States has stationed troops in a little city of our Commonwealth with the design, as cannot be doubted, of intimidating the people and controlling the pending election for partisan purposes.

So much for the testimony of the Mayor of Petersburg, substantiated by the testimony of the Governor of Virginia, that there was no occasion whatever for the presence of United States troops on that occasion.

But there was another official who testified differently. He was then United States district attorney for the Eastern District of Virginia, and he wrote a letter to Dr. Jorgensen, pledging himself to go to Washington and tell the President that in his judgment it would be criminal to fail to send troops to Petersburg. True to his word, he made the following affidavit:

"I am from my knowledge that the last State election, and other elections held in Petersburg prepared to say that unless the marshal is furnished with a better and more reliable posse than he will be able to summon to his aid from residents of the city, the election on the 7th of November in that city will be a farce as gigantic as it will be fraudulent. I am not now prepared to express the opinion that the presence of troops to assist the marshal's posse will be essential to the preservation of order and to insure a fair election at other points in the Eastern District of Virginia, but of the necessity of their presence to prevent bloodshed and SECURE A FAIR ELECTION IN PETERSBURG (I repeat ours). I think there cannot be a shadow of doubt." (See Congressional Record, Forty-fourth Congress, second session, p. 563.)

The United States official holding office under the Republican administration who made that affidavit and who did what he could to bring these troops into Virginia on election day, was L. L. Lewis, the man who is now running for Governor of Virginia on the Republican ticket. He speaks with absolute certainty as to the need of troops in Petersburg, yet in a speech subsequently delivered by Colonel R. E. Withers, of Virginia, in the Senate of the United States, reviewing this outrage, it was stated that Mr. Lewis was not in the Fourth Congressional District during that canvass and could not of his personal knowledge have known that troops were needed in Petersburg.

Now, Democrats of Virginia, how do you like the exhibit? Some of you are saying that Judge Lewis is such a fine gentleman that he will make a fine Governor. We have reminded you from time to time that although Judge Lewis is a fine gentleman, he is a life-long Republican; that he has repeatedly held office under a Republican administration; that he has in all campaigns stood with the Republican party, and now we show by the record that in 1876, it was upon his suggestion and assurances that a Republican President sent United States troops to the city of Petersburg in order "to insure a fair election." Judge Lewis pleads eloquently for the new Republican party, bleached and reformed. But it is the same old party and he was a member of it in the days of reconstruction, force bills and Federal troops-at the polls, returning boards, Hayes Electoral Commission and all the rest, and he must bear his part of the responsibility for the acts of his party.

A Republican with such a political record cannot be elected Governor of Virginia. In 1876 he asked for Federal troops in Virginia on election day in defiance of the protest of the then Governor of Virginia. It is a fair inference that if he should himself be Governor of Virginia, and the campaign of 1876 should be repeated, he would call for Federal troops.

How can any Democrat think of voting for such a man?

What Mr. Roosevelt Denied.

"It seems to be a fair question," remarks the Springfield Republican, "whether it seems to be a fair question whether President Roosevelt does not owe Judge Albert B. Parker a public apology. The President's quick sense of 'squareness' must certainly be much troubled by the disclosure that at the very moment in November when he was hotly resenting Judge Parker's charges regarding the squeezing of corporations for Republican campaign money, the committee charged with forwarding his canvass was accepting money abstracted from a fund for the assistance of widows and orphans and using it to promote his election. Probably Judge Parker at the time never supposed the case was quite as flagrant as it is now known to have been."

It may be inferred from this and similar statements that President Roosevelt denied that the Republican campaign committee had received any contributions from corporations. It is fair to state, however, that the President made no such denial. In fact he admitted that such contributions had been made, but what he did deny with indignation was the charge of Judge Parker that Secretary Cortelyou had used the information which he had gained as a member of the President's Cabinet to compel the corporations to come down with the cash.

It is none of our business to defend Mr. Roosevelt. We are simply giving information in the interest of truth.

The Irreligious Hat.

The rector of a Jersey City church has taken the ladies of his congregation to task for their increasing tendency to come to church without their hats. Upon his return from a European trip, the parson noticed that this habit had grown apace, and he forthwith reproved the women of the church in the columns of the parish weekly. The point is rather an interesting one. The Jersey City rector based his argument mainly upon the fact that "the glory of a woman is her hair," upon which, as one of her chief charms, the sex is wont to lavish much time and attention. He says that an elaborate coiffure hatlessly displayed in church is a means of attracting the attention of men and "is not in harmony with the angelic spirit which we have just described." This point viewed in a purely controversial

dent for protection against domestic or other violence. No complaint is made anywhere that the rights of any citizen are assailed or threatened. But in the midst of profound peace and without a constitutional regulation from any quarter, the President of the United States has stationed troops in a little city of our Commonwealth with the design, as cannot be doubted, of intimidating the people and controlling the pending election for partisan purposes.

So much for the testimony of the Mayor of Petersburg, substantiated by the testimony of the Governor of Virginia, that there was no occasion whatever for the presence of United States troops on that occasion.

But there was another official who testified differently. He was then United States district attorney for the Eastern District of Virginia, and he wrote a letter to Dr. Jorgensen, pledging himself to go to Washington and tell the President that in his judgment it would be criminal to fail to send troops to Petersburg. True to his word, he made the following affidavit:

"I am from my knowledge that the last State election, and other elections held in Petersburg prepared to say that unless the marshal is furnished with a better and more reliable posse than he will be able to summon to his aid from residents of the city, the election on the 7th of November in that city will be a farce as gigantic as it will be fraudulent. I am not now prepared to express the opinion that the presence of troops to assist the marshal's posse will be essential to the preservation of order and to insure a fair election at other points in the Eastern District of Virginia, but of the necessity of their presence to prevent bloodshed and SECURE A FAIR ELECTION IN PETERSBURG (I repeat ours). I think there cannot be a shadow of doubt." (See Congressional Record, Forty-fourth Congress, second session, p. 563.)

The United States official holding office under the Republican administration who made that affidavit and who did what he could to bring these troops into Virginia on election day, was L. L. Lewis, the man who is now running for Governor of Virginia on the Republican ticket. He speaks with absolute certainty as to the need of troops in Petersburg, yet in a speech subsequently delivered by Colonel R. E. Withers, of Virginia, in the Senate of the United States, reviewing this outrage, it was stated that Mr. Lewis was not in the Fourth Congressional District during that canvass and could not of his personal knowledge have known that troops were needed in Petersburg.

Now, Democrats of Virginia, how do you like the exhibit? Some of you are saying that Judge Lewis is such a fine gentleman that he will make a fine Governor. We have reminded you from time to time that although Judge Lewis is a fine gentleman, he is a life-long Republican; that he has repeatedly held office under a Republican administration; that he has in all campaigns stood with the Republican party, and now we show by the record that in 1876, it was upon his suggestion and assurances that a Republican President sent United States troops to the city of Petersburg in order "to insure a fair election." Judge Lewis pleads eloquently for the new Republican party, bleached and reformed. But it is the same old party and he was a member of it in the days of reconstruction, force bills and Federal troops-at the polls, returning boards, Hayes Electoral Commission and all the rest, and he must bear his part of the responsibility for the acts of his party.

A Republican with such a political record cannot be elected Governor of Virginia. In 1876 he asked for Federal troops in Virginia on election day in defiance of the protest of the then Governor of Virginia. It is a fair inference that if he should himself be Governor of Virginia, and the campaign of 1876 should be repeated, he would call for Federal troops.

How can any Democrat think of voting for such a man?

What Mr. Roosevelt Denied.

"It seems to be a fair question," remarks the Springfield Republican, "whether it seems to be a fair question whether President Roosevelt does not owe Judge Albert B. Parker a public apology. The President's quick sense of 'squareness' must certainly be much troubled by the disclosure that at the very moment in November when he was hotly resenting Judge Parker's charges regarding the squeezing of corporations for Republican campaign money, the committee charged with forwarding his canvass was accepting money abstracted from a fund for the assistance of widows and orphans and using it to promote his election. Probably Judge Parker at the time never supposed the case was quite as flagrant as it is now known to have been."

It may be inferred from this and similar statements that President Roosevelt denied that the Republican campaign committee had received any contributions from corporations. It is fair to state, however, that the President made no such denial. In fact he admitted that such contributions had been made, but what he did deny with indignation was the charge of Judge Parker that Secretary Cortelyou had used the information which he had gained as a member of the President's Cabinet to compel the corporations to come down with the cash.

It is none of our business to defend Mr. Roosevelt. We are simply giving information in the interest of truth.

## Dr. Lyon's PERFECT Tooth Powder

Cleanses and beautifies the teeth and purifies the breath. Used by people of refinement for over a quarter of a century.

Convenient for tourists.

PREPARED BY

J. H. Lyon, D.D.S.

april, would seem to be a very bad one.

If the chief glory of a woman is her hair the hat, in these days, is an even "cheater" one. The time a woman spends by doing up her hair is as nothing to the time she spends in planning and selecting her Easter or autumnal bonnet, and a stunning hat is no less calculated to attract man's favorable notice than is a fascinating coiffure. The real reason which would seem to be at the root of the matter is merely ancient custom founded upon the Apostle Paul's well-remembered dictum, which has left many with the instinctive feeling that for a woman to wear her hat into church is the only natural, decorous and seemly thing to do.

But it is nevertheless a strange thing to us that any preacher should discourage the women of his congregation in coming to church hatless. The big hat is, as such an abstraction in church as in places of amusement. In fact, more so, for in the theatre the rear seat is somewhat elevated, whereas in church the seats are all on a dead level. A high hat in church often shuts off your view of the preacher, distracts your attention, sometimes reminding one of an unpaid millinery bill, and one Virginia editor is frank enough to confess that he has upon occasion taken refuge behind a tower of millinery and indulged in a Sunday morning snooze. Taking all these things into consideration we are persuaded that the modern hat is a form of worldly diversion and should be excluded from all places of worship—if the women will only consent.

It is confidently believed that that engaging little humorist, Nellie Nussbunn, who wrote threatening "Black Hand" letters to her own papa, now feels the desirability of taking supper from the Nussbunn mantelpiece.

Mr. Dixon says his purpose in putting on his play is "reconciliation through knowledge of the truth." It is not to be inferred, however, that activity at the box office is a matter of absolute indifference.

That German count who married his washerwoman's daughter was no doubt merely actuated by a wholesome desire to cut down his laundry bills.

Now it is stated that the Equitable runs a profitable restaurant as a side line. Those wily directors did not fail to perceive the big money in the tipping system.

Now Mr. Witto is saying that he made peace in order to get rid of the mosquitoes. At last some one has pointed out an advantage in being a Russian.

How good and blessed a thing it is for brother Scandinavians to dwell together in unity.

If Japan is really spoiling for some more fighting, let her turn attention to Don Cipriano Castro.

Add five more to the fatal sacrifices to railroad carelessness.

Some of the shine seems to have gotten rubbed off that grand jury probe.

The Corporation Commission appears to be threatened with a general strike.

Vesuvius remains quiet, but Mr. J. L. Gleaves is once more in eruption.

Respect for the Dead.

Editor of The Times-Dispatch: